

aggressive to correct its problems, especially in light of their magnitude and complexity. The HUD blueprint proposes to consolidate only 60 programs into 3—leaving unanswered the question of what becomes of the remaining 140 programs.

Congress must do a top-to-bottom review of HUD programs. Most require major overhaul—a process that involves rewriting statutes and reducing Federal regulations. Therefore, as part of my review, I intend to find ways in addition to the blueprint, to reform, consolidate, streamline, and if appropriate, eliminate outdated housing programs.

As part of this review, I am looking at new approaches to administering HUD programs in a cost-efficient, yet people-friendly manner so that as many families as possible can get housing. I intend to explore various options to deregulate programs so that States and local jurisdictions are provided with all the authority they require to operate independently—both financially and administratively. It is my feeling that unless localities have unfettered discretion to operate their programs, with the fewest possible attached strings, deregulation is illusory.

Finally, I want to review HUD's budget. Every Member of this House is aware that all Federal agencies must tighten their belts in order to reduce the budget deficit and pay for the middle-income tax cut. HUD cannot be excused from this effort.

It is my intention to work with HUD and with my former chairman, HENRY GONZALEZ, for whom I have great respect, as the committee reviews the proposals in the blueprint, particularly insofar as they are based on Republican efforts over the last 12 years. I welcome many of the blueprint's core ideas as a beginning, but intend to take a hard look at them and to expand upon them, so that they become in actuality what they appear to be in concept.

RESTRICTED EXPLOSIVES CONTROL ACT

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to reintroduce the Restricted Explosives Control Act, a consequential piece of legislation that I sponsored in the 103d Congress.

Not only does my legislation require a Federal permit for all purchases of explosives, it also dictates that all applicants must submit a photograph as well as a set of fingerprints along with their permit application. The bill defines "restricted explosives" as: high explosives, blasting agents, detonators, and more than 50 pounds of black powder.

In addition, the legislation will not unduly burden legitimate explosives purchasers. The bill establishes a 6-month grace period, before the measure is implemented, to enable people to obtain Federal permits from the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms [ATF].

During the holiday season of 1993, four mail bombs exploded in western New York—taking five innocent lives. Current law enabled those accused in the murders to buy the deadly dynamite in Kentucky, simply by providing false identification, completing a short form furnished by the ATF, and promising not to cross State lines.

Once this measure is enacted, never again will an individual be able to walk into an explosives dealer's office, quickly fill out a short Federal form, and walk out with dynamite or some other type of high explosive.

The Restricted Explosives Control Act is endorsed by the Institute of Makers of Explosives, the very people who manufacture explosives. The bill also is endorsed by the National Rifle Association.

This legislation is a solid proposal that will prevent such tragedies. The fact is that current law allows for dynamite and other explosives to be sold over the counter. The Restricted Explosives Control Act must be implemented without delay so that we may close that deadly loophole in Federal explosives law.

**HONORING DR. PAUL MICHAEL
KAZAS**

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, one of the pleasures of serving in this legislative body is the opportunity we occasionally get to acknowledge publicly outstanding citizens of our Nation.

I rise today to honor Dr. Paul Michael Kazas, a model citizen. I congratulate Dr. Kazas for his recent election as president to the Woodhaven Residents' Block Association. If he brings the same dedication that he has brought to his other pursuits, then there is little doubt that this organization will blossom and grow.

Dr. Kazas belongs to some 20 civic professional organizations, and actively serves on five different board of directors. While others lead and leave the work to others, Dr. Kazas is never afraid to get his hands dirty. He cleans the traffic islands from Park Lane South to 91st Avenue on Woodhaven Boulevard; he was involved with repainting the nearby Interborough Parkway Overpass; he became a certified street pruner so that the community could receive a \$15,000 grant from the New York State Department of Environment Conservation to plant trees on Jamaica Avenue. He is truly a remarkable individual.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in commending Dr. Kazas for his tireless work. He is worthy of our recognition for making Queens County and the city of New York a better place in which to live.

**NO MORE TAXPAYER SUBSIDY
FOR WESTERN EUROPE**

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 11, 1995

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the biggest single mistake we are making in public policy today is to continue to spend far more on the military than is necessary. We have not responded responsibly to the collapse of the Soviet Union and our victory in the cold war. In particular, we continue to act

as if Western Europe is in need of subsidy for its defense from the American taxpayers.

During our recess, on December 3, Jack Beatty, senior editor at the Atlantic Monthly, wrote an excellent essay in the Boston Globe pointing out the irrationality of our current policy. I was flattered to read Mr. Beatty's forthright assertion that "NATO is an exorbitant anachronism" and I ask that his very persuasive essay be printed here. I hope that Members will read and think about it as we prepare to vote on the fiscal 1996 budget.

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 3, 1994]

**NATO: IT'S TIME THE EUROPEANS FOUND
THEIR OWN WAY**

(By Jack Beatty)

NATO is an exorbitant anachronism. Widely regretted by columnists and editorial writers, the current rift among the NATO allies over Bosnia should instead be seen as a welcome development, a chance to reorder national priorities. We can no longer afford to defend countries with higher standards of living than our own against a vanished threat. The Cold War is over, but the peace dividend has been swallowed up by NATO.

We continue to spend \$75 billion to \$100 billion annually on the defense of Western Europe—this largely to maintain the 150,000 US troops stationed there. The Clinton administration wants to cut that force by 50,000 by 1999. What is the rationale for keeping 100,000 troops in Europe into the next millennium? To repel any future Russian invasion of Lithuania. Unbelievably, that was the sole European case offered in the seven possible war scenarios leaked from the Pentagon two years ago.

We have no treaty commitments to Lithuania. For 50 years we tolerated the Soviet occupation of Lithuania without harm to our national well-being. Lithuania is to Russia as Haiti is to us, a small country within a big country's sphere of influence. Yet the Pentagon expects US taxpayers to fork over more than \$50 billion every year to preserve a free Lithuania.

Military welfare to Europe should be as hot a political button as domestic welfare to women and children, and perhaps it would be if the British, Danes and Germans we are saving from the costly inconvenience of defending Lithuania all by themselves were—how to put it?—stigmatically nonwhite. But with the elites of both parties under the platitudinous spell of the foreign policy establishment, it will probably take a third party to raise the issue.

Counter-arguments? Two are usually cited. First, we would lose influence within the alliance if we had no ground troops stationed on alliance soil. Second, only isolationists could advocate abandoning the forward-deployment strategy taught by the bitter experience of two Europe-made world wars.

Lose influence within the alliance? What influence? The Clinton administration's fruitless efforts to change alliance policy on Bosnia shows how little influence we have. To be sure, we might have had more if, like the British and French, we had dispatched peace-keepers to Bosnia, a place with no peace to keep. But influence at the price of folly is a bad bargain.

The idea that we should "lead the alliance," that the European powers have grown soft behind the generous welfare states our defense spending has let them afford, has surface plausibility. Certainly the British and French have not shown much spine in Bosnia. But unpack that word "lead" and you'll find it means something like this: If we continue to spend more to defend Europe than the European countries spend to defend themselves, and if we are willing to station